

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA

SCANNED at WVCF and Emailed on

CHRISTOPHER L. SCRUGGS,

6-14-19 by A.G. - 3 pages.
(date) (Initials) (num)

Case No. 3:16-ek-00033

v.
WEST / MILLER

- SCRUGGS' OBJECTION(S) TO JUDGE ROBERT L. -
- MILLER'S ORDER, JUNE 12, 2019 -

I, Christopher L. Scruggs respectfully make the following objection to Judge Robert L. Miller's June 12, 2019 Order.

1. Scruggs object to the Court's / Judge's ruling that states that, "Scruggs seems to want a lawyer who will return the case to square one and do a better job of filing all the motions that Scruggs has placed before the Court, that isn't Mr. Hays's role...". Scruggs object to this Court ruling as this very Judge told Scruggs that he terminate Scruggs' motions just until Hays made his appearances. Now Hays and the Court will not allow Scruggs to refile his motion, here the Court abused it's discretion twice, first by terminating Scruggs motion then by closing the dispositive motion deadline behind Scruggs' back when the Court already told Scruggs that he could refile his motions.

2. The whole appointment of counsel was just a way for the Court to get around ruling on Scruggs' motions. The Court appointed counsel and told him not to refile Scruggs' motions. Scruggs object as Scruggs never asked Hays to rewrite his motions, Scruggs only ask Hays to refile his motions which the defendants had already responded to. Scruggs further object as the Court gave Scruggs leave to refile his motions, then for some unknown reason the Court phone does not work and the Judge does not reschedule the hearing, he closes out motions Scruggs file in Court and intended to refile.

3. Scruggs object to the Court ruling that Hays did a good job for Scruggs when Hays would not refile a motion Scruggs asked him to file over and over. Why would the Court tell Scruggs that he could refile his motion, then when he tried to get it file tell Scruggs that he did something wrong, then punish Scruggs by telling Scruggs

he is "battling" Mr. Hays. How am I battling Hays by asking him to refile a motion the Court told me I could refile and that I repeatedly asked him to refile. How am I battling an attorney that knows I want my motion refiled, but goes into Court and allows the Court to close the dispositive motion deadline. Here, the Court uses its discretion to punish Seruggs for waiting his motions which took him months to write, refile and for speaking up for himself when Hays would not refile a motion the Court said I could refile. Why is Seruggs to be punished with no attorney for trying to file something the Court told him it was okay to do?

4. Seruggs object to the Court's ruling that Seruggs wants a lawyer who will revisit and extend of the entire pretrial phases of the case. Seruggs never asked for this. Seruggs only asked the Court appointed attorney to look into the defendant's misconduct which is what Seruggs motion for sanction is all about. However, the Court is only to allow the I.D.O.C. to keep its ability to alter video at will because the just don't want inmates to have any real evidence that they are being assaulted by state staff.

5. Seruggs object to the Court's ruling that it will address Seruggs' refiled motions soon when it appears that the Court has already addressed Seruggs motion as the Court states that the time allowed for dispositive motions has expired. However, this also is an abuse of discretion as Seruggs' motions were first filed before the dispositive motion was close. Here, the Court abused its powers to trick Seruggs out of his properly filed motion for sanction. Here, the Court has already denied Seruggs motion as it has already stated that it is time to find the case.

6. Seruggs further object to the Court's ruling that it will not appoint new ^{counsel} just because Seruggs complained when the Court appointed ~~these~~ counsel would not refile a motion the Court told Seruggs he could refile.

7. Next, Seruggs object to the Court's ruling that it has already ruled on Seruggs' motion for sanction when it has not. The only ruling on Seruggs' motion for sanction is that Seruggs had leave to refile it. Then the Court secretly closed out Seruggs' motion with the aid of an attorney which was working with the Court to accomplish this very thing. I will be appealing.

RESPECTFULLY,
Christopher L. Serugg

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Christopher L. Sennys hereby, certify that on June 12, 2019 the foregoing "Objection" was pursuant to Fed. R. Cr. P. 5(b)(2)(F) electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court through the Prisoner E-filing Program.

RESPECTFULLY,
Christopher L. Sennys
Christopher L. Sennys #957096
P.O. Box 1111 / SC 21-B-504
Carlisle, In. 47888-1111